



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,064	03/29/2001	Messaoud Benantar	AUS920010140US1	5311
65362	7590	03/03/2008		
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP			EXAMINER	
IBM Austin			BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
P.O. BOX 203518				
AUSTIN, TX 78720				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/821,064  
Filing Date: March 29, 2001  
Appellant(s): BENANTAR, MESSAOUD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Rocco Cannatti  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/7/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 7/02/2007.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,691,232	WOOD	2-2004
5,339,403	PARKER	8-1994

6,766,454	RIGGINS	7-2004
6,460,141	OLDEN	10-2002
6,754,829	BUTT	6-2004

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232, in view of Parker US 5,339,403**

As per claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 19, and 21, Wood teaches use of a certificate for authentication in a single sign on system, (Col 5 lines 50-65). Wood teaches authenticating the user for subsequent authentication via the certificate, (Col 6 lines 4-10).

Wood does not teach an attribute certificate.

Parker teaches an attribute certificate including authentication information, (Col 1 lines 40-45). Parker teaches a system to approve access by and authenticate by forwarding the attribute certificate to a controlled resource (applications) (Col 1 lines 45-50).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Wood with the certificate of Parker because the certificate is from a trusted secure source.

Claims 2, 5, 12, 15, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 in view of Riggins US 6,766,454.

As per claims 2, 5, 12, 15, 20, and 23, the prior Wood-Parker combination teaches an SSO attribute certificate including authentication information. Wood-Parker does not teach asymmetrical encryption.

Riggins teaches encryption of messages with the public key of the recipient, and decryption with a private key (Col 2 lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the encryption of Riggins with the certificate of Parker, because the encryption makes the communication secure.

**Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.**

**103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 Olden US 6,460,141**

As per claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17, 22, 24, and 25, the Wood-Parker combination teaches a certificate containing, an issuer name (AID), signature (KUA), and holder, (Attr), (Parker Col 3 lines 5-30). Wood-Parker does not teach legacy applications and multiple sets of data.

As per claims Olden teaches using a user Id and password in conjunction with legacy applications, wherein multiple sets of authentication data and parameters are stored in conjunction with single sign on (Col 25 lines 20-27)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the legacy application of Olden in the system of Wood-Parker, because it is important to maintain backwards compatibility.

**Claims 8, 18, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood US 6,691,232 in view of Parker US 5,339,403 in view of Butt US 6,754,829**

As per claims 7, 20, and 31, the previous Wood-Parker combination does not disclose a X.509 certificate format.

Butt teaches the X.509 certificate format, (Col 4 lines 54-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the x.509 format with the certificate of the Parker-Riggins combination because the x.509

**(10) Response to Argument**

**A. Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 19 and 21 are obvious over Wood and Parker**

As per claims independent claims 1, 11, and 19 the appellant argues that the combination of Wood and Parker does not meet the limitations of the independent claims. The appellant argues with regards to the specification, but it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed.Cir.1993).

The examiner has a duty to read the claims with the broadest reasonable interpretation.

The appellant argues that the SSO agent uses an attribute certificate in an initial and subsequent authentication regarding the user and the various services that the user is trying to access. The appellant argues that the combination of Wood and Parker do not meet these limitations.

The examiner has interpreted the independent claims 1, 11, and 19, and Wood in a different manner than the appellant.

Appellant asserts that the subsequent authentication requests are not taught in Wood.

Reading from claim 1, the examiner asserts that Wood teaches an SSO agent 120 that accepts login credentials including certificates to authenticate a user (Col 5

lines 50-65). Wood also teaches that the user may have to be authenticated an initial and subsequent time (Col 6 lines 1-10). Wood describes subsequent authentication requests are to achieve a sufficient trust level with the SSO component. Wood teaches that a certificate may be used as a credential (Col 5 line 62). The SSO agent retrieves the certificate from the user to authenticate the user. Wood does not explicitly teach an attribute certificate. Parker remedies this deficiency by teaching the use of a privileges (attribute) certificate in an SSO system (Col 1 lines 40-45).

Appellants argue that the certificate in Parker is presented by the user, but this is irrelevant as Parker is not relied on for its authentication framework, only its explicit teaching of the attribute certificate.

Appellant argues that there is no motivation to combine Wood with Parker. The examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the certificate of Parker with the system of Wood. The references are of analogous arts, and Parker is only relied on for the specific "attribute" certificate. Wood teaches a certificate may be used as the login credential in Col 5 line 63. Parker merely teaches a specific version of said certificate.

Finally appellant argues that Wood teaches away from the present invention because it only teaches "a single authentication". As the Examiner has stated, Wood may perform an initial and subsequent authentication to assure the user has a sufficient trust level with the SSO agent.



**B. C. and D.**

Appellant relies on arguments regarding the independent claims in furtherance of all dependent claims 2, 4 -8, 10, 12, 14-18, 20, 23-26. The examiner has addressed the arguments regarding the independent claims, and thus the dependent claims are also addressed.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Brown

/C. J. B./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134

Conferees:

Kambiz Zand

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134

Kim VU

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135